UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,119	02/19/2002	Edmund G. Lou	SUNMP040	6772

25920   7590   09/16/2005

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER
AHLUWALIA, NAVNEET K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/079,119	LOU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Navneet K. Ahluwalia	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 February 2002*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 February 2002* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The application has been examined. Claims 1 – 20 are pending in this office

action.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

because reference characters 102 and 104 have both been used to designate

Application & Test Code in Figures 1 and 2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance

with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of

the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the

figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is

being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application

must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

        In the detailed description of the preferred embodiments page 8 line 22 the

application program is referred to as element 102 and the reporter plug-in as element

104 but on page 9 line 21 and onwards, the application program has been referred to as

element 102. The reference elements need to be numbered and referred to consistently

throughout the application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 12 and 15 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Barker et al. ('Barker herein after') (US 6,781,609 B1).

With respect to claim 1,

Barker teaches a method for generating an extensible markup language (XML)

test result file, comprising the operations of:

receiving a key parameter and a value parameter, wherein the key parameter

relates to a tag (column 2 lines 10 – 13);

generating a first string based on the key parameter and the value parameter,

wherein the first string includes a first beginning tag and a first ending tag (Figure 5B

tags enclosing element 521) based on the key parameter, wherein the first string

includes the value parameter (Figure 5B element 521) positioned between the first

beginning tag and the first ending tag (Figure 5B elements enclosing element 540); and

inserting the first string (Figure 5B tags enclosing elements 520 and 540 and the

data enclosed in the tags <GROUP> and </GROUP>) into test results file storing a

second string having a second beginning tag (Figure 5B element <DATA-GROUP>) and

a second ending tag (Figure 5B element </DATA-GROUP>), wherein the first string is

inserted between the second beginning tag and a second ending tag (Figure 5B all

elements and data enclosed in <DATA-GROUP> and </DATA-GROUP>).

With respect to claim 2,

Barker teaches the method wherein the first beginning tag and the first ending

tag are based on a document type definition (DTD) (column 9 lines 8 – 10).

With respect to claim 3,

Barker teaches the method further comprising the operation of creating a test

results hash table that stores key parameters related to the test results file (column 4

lines 38 – 39).

With respect to claim 4,

Barker teaches the method further comprising the operation of generating a file

pointer tree having a plurality of nodes, each node referenced by a node pointer in the

test results hash table (column 11 lines 23 – 26 and column 12 lines 13 – 16).

With respect to claim 5,

Barker teaches the method wherein each node stores a begin value and an end

value related to a particular key (column 11 lines 27 – 32).

With respect to claim 8,

Barker teaches a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium

for generating an extensible markup language (XML) test result file, comprising:

a code segment that receives a key parameter and a value parameter, wherein

the key parameter relates to a tag (column 2 lines 10 – 13);

a code segment that generates a first string based on the key parameter and the value parameter, wherein the first string includes a first beginning tag and a first ending tag (Figure 5B tags enclosing element 521) based on the key parameter, and wherein the first string includes the value parameter (Figure 5B element 521) positioned between the first beginning tag and the first ending tag (Figure 5B elements enclosing element 540); and

a code segment that inserts the first string (Figure 5B tags enclosing elements 520 and 540 and the data enclosed in the tags <GROUP> and </GROUP>) into a test results file storing a second string having a second beginning tag (Figure 5B element <DATA-GROUP>) and a second ending tag (Figure 5B element </DATA-GROUP>), wherein the first string is inserted between the second beginning tag and a second ending tag (Figure 5B all elements and data enclosed in <DATA-GROUP> and </DATA-GROUP>).

With respect to claim 9,

Barker teaches a computer program wherein the first beginning tag and the first ending tag are based on a document type definition (DTD) (column 9 lines 8 – 10).

With respect to claim 10,

Barker teaches a computer program further comprising a code segment that creates a test results hash table for storing key parameters related to the test results file (column 4 lines 38 – 39).

With respect to claim 11,

Barker teaches a computer program further comprising a code segment that generates a file pointer tree having a plurality of nodes, each node referenced by a node pointer in the test results hash table (column 11 lines 23 – 26 and column 12 lines 13 – 16).

With respect to claim 12,

Barker teaches a computer program wherein each node stores a begin value and an end value related to a particular key (column 11 lines 27 – 32).

With respect to claim 15,

Barker teaches a system for generating an extensible markup language (XML) test result file, comprising:

an application program that includes application testing instructions, the application testing instructions capable of generating test result data (the instructions being in the form of tags and values able to be processed to form a string as a result column 2 lines 10 – 13);

an XML reporter object in communication with the application program, wherein the XML reporter object receives the test result data from the application program, and wherein the XML reporter object processes the test result (the testing phase is explained in column 3 lines 13 – 19) data to generate an XML based string (the data/ value is received and then processed to be inserted between its beginning and ending tags Figure 5B elements enclosing element 540); and

an XML test results file in communication with the XML reporter object, wherein

the XML reporter inserts the XML based string into the XML test results file (Figure 5B

all elements and data enclosed in <DATA-GROUP> and </DATA-GROUP>).

With respect to claim 16,

Barker teaches a system wherein the XML test results file is a well formed and

valid XML file based on a particular document type definition (DTD) (column 9 lines 8 –

10).

With respect to claim 17,

Barker teaches a system wherein the XML reporter object further receives a key

parameter related to the test result data from the application program (column 2 lines 10

– 13).

With respect to claim 18,

Barker teaches a system wherein the XML reporter object includes a test results

hash table for storing key parameters related to the test results file (column 4 lines 38 –

39).

With respect to claim 19,   ·

Barker teaches a system wherein the XML reporter object includes a file pointer

tree having a plurality of nodes, each node referenced by a node pointer in the test

results hash table (column 11 lines 23 – 26 and column 12 lines 13 – 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7.   Claims 6, 7, 13, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Barker et al. ('Barker herein after') (US 6,781,609 B1) in view of Scott

et al. ('Scott herein after') (US 2002/0049760 A1).

With respect to claim 6,

Barker teaches a beginning tag and a corresponding ending tag to a

particular key (Figure 5B elements enclosing element 540).

Barker does not explicitly indicate the file positions corresponding to the

tags.

Scott teaches claimed file positions begin value indicating a file position after a corresponding beginning tag related to the particular key, and wherein the end value corresponds to a file position after a corresponding ending tag related to the particular key (Page 5 paragraph [0054] lines 5 – 7, Scott).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because they are both used in a peer-to-peer kind environment, the hash id and configuration to store information files of Scott would have allowed Barker's method to provide the speed reliability and better file access (Page 1 paragraph [0005] lines 2 – 5).

With respect to claim 7,

Barker teaches inserting the first string into the second string (Figure 5B all elements and data enclosed in <DATA-GROUP> and </DATA-GROUP>).

Barker does not explicitly indicate the begin and end values.

Scott teaches claimed begin and end values for the insertion of the first string into the second string (Page 5 paragraph [0054] lines 5 – 7, Scott).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because they are both used in a peer-to-peer kind environment, the hash id and configuration to store information files of Scott would have allowed Barker's method to provide the speed reliability and better file access (Page 1

paragraph [0005] lines 2 – 5). Furthermore, it would have given faster access to

files/ data.

With respect to claim 13,

Barker teaches a beginning tag and a corresponding ending tag to a

particular key (Figure 5B elements enclosing element 540).

Barker does not explicitly indicate the file positions corresponding to the

tags.

Scott teaches claimed file positions begin value indicating a file position

after a corresponding beginning tag related to the particular key, and wherein the

end value corresponds to a file position after a corresponding ending tag related

to the particular key (Page 5 paragraph [0054] lines 5 – 7, Scott).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data

processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited

references because they are both used in a peer-to-peer kind environment, the

hash id and configuration to store information files of Scott would have allowed

Barker's computer program to provide the speed reliability and better file access

(Page 1 paragraph [0005] lines 2 – 5).

With respect to claim 14,

Barker teaches inserting the first string into the second string (Figure 5B

all elements and data enclosed in <DATA-GROUP> and </DATA-GROUP>).

Barker does not explicitly indicate the begin and end values.

Scott teaches claimed begin and end values for the insertion of the first

string into the second string (Page 5 paragraph [0054] lines 5 – 7, Scott).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data

processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited

references because they are both used in a peer-to-peer kind environment, the

hash id and configuration to store information files of Scott would have allowed

Barker's computer program to provide the speed reliability and better file access

(Page 1 paragraph [0005] lines 2 – 5). Furthermore, it would have given faster

access to files/ data.

With respect to claim 20,

Barker teaches wherein each node stores a begin value and an end value

related to a particular key (column 11 lines 27 – 32), a beginning tag and a

corresponding ending tag to a particular key (Figure 5B elements enclosing

element 540).

Barker does not explicitly indicate the file positions corresponding to the

tags.

Scott teaches claimed file positions begin value indicating a file position

after a corresponding beginning tag related to the particular key, and wherein the

end value corresponds to a file position after a corresponding ending tag related

to the particular key (Page 5 paragraph [0054] lines 5 – 7, Scott).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data

processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited

references because they are both used in a peer-to-peer kind environment, the

hash id and configuration to store information files of Scott would have allowed

Barker's system to provide the speed reliability and better file access (Page 1

paragraph [0005] lines 2 – 5).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Navneet K. Ahluwalia whose telephone number is 571-272-5636. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam T. Hosain can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Navneet K. Ahluwalia
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

Date: 09/13/2005

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER